1		KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
2		Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers
3		January 21, 2020 @ 5:30 pm
4 5 6 7 8	made reade <u>http:</u>	e minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motions e, should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting. If the er would like to hear specific discussion, they should visit Kitsap County's Website at <a href="https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm">//www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm</a> and listen to the audio file (to assist in locating mation, time-stamps are provided below).
0 1		bers present: Kim Allen (Chair), Aaron Murphy (Vice Chair), Amy Maule, Richard Shattuck, Jim son, Joe Phillips, Mike Eliason, Ed Galliway
2	Mem	bers absent:
3	Staff	present: Peter Best, Darren Gurnee, Jeff Rimack, Angie Silva, Amanda Walston (Clerk)
4		
5		5:30:46
6	A.	Introductions
7		Chair Allen welcomes new PC Ed Galliway.
8	В.	Adoption of Agenda
9		<ul> <li>Chair Allen proposes a revision to the agenda to postpone Approval of Minutes and General Elections to follow Item F (Public Hearing).</li> </ul>
1		<ul> <li>MOTION: Mike Eliason moves to adopt the agenda as revised</li> </ul>
<u> </u>		SECOND: Joe Phillips
3		<ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in Favor – Motion carries</li> </ul>
1	C.	General Elections
5		Move to Item H, to follow the Public Hearing
5	D.	Approval of Minutes
7		Moved to Item I, to follow the General Elections
3	E.	General Comment:
)		Chair Allen notes this period is for comment on items not scheduled on the agenda,
) L		calls for any speakers.
		<ul> <li>Hearing None, Chair Allen closes the comment period.</li> </ul>
<u>.</u>		5:32:45
}  -	F.	Work Study: 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) Update: Peter Best, DCD PEP Planner
		<ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck notes a potential conflict of interest related to the Dickey Pit Site and recuses himself after confirmation that the work study will focus on the Dickey Pit site specific application.</li> </ul>
3 ) )		<ul> <li>Mr. Best provides a brief, general overview of the CPA Update process to date, noting that public comments received as of 1/21 were provided to the Planning Commission (PC) last week; since then 10 additional comments have been received, which will be</li> </ul>

1 2	forwarded along with comments heard tonight, and any others received through the end of the comment period.
3	5:48:05
4 5 6	<ul> <li>Mr. Best provides an overview of the Dickey Pit Site Specific Amendment, site and department's recommendation and alternatives for consideration, noting the Staff Report is quite large, with multiple attachments.</li> </ul>
7 8 9	<ul> <li>Mr. Best references a visual presentation, noting current and proposed zoning, surrounding properties; the department recommends denial of this site specific amendment.</li> </ul>
10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Mr. Best notes the original application was submitted in 2018, then withdrawn, revised and submitted in 2019 with 3 alternative proposals that addressed some of the issues raised in the SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS); proposed non- motorized connections as well as a proposed road connection from Dickey Road to Willamette Meridian with a gated connection for emergency access. Staff's preference is to open this up to a Right-of-Way for transportation improvement.</li> </ul>
16 17	<ul> <li>Mr. Best reviews a conceptual graphic submitted by the applicant, clarifying this is not the proposed project, but a concept of what could be done.</li> </ul>
18	6:05:25
19	<ul> <li>Mr. Best reviewed the 4 main points of rationale for recommendation of denial.</li> </ul>
20 21	<ul> <li>Additional growth capacity is not needed for population or employment, and has been slower than projected.</li> </ul>
22 23 24	<ul> <li>Proposed up-zone would attract growth outside the Silverdale Regional Growth Center, intended to be areas of high intensity residential and employment development.</li> </ul>
25 26	<ul> <li>Incompatible with adjacent land uses, nearby surface mine has planned expansion with operations likely to continue for 40 – 50 years.</li> </ul>
27	<ul> <li>Reduces supply of vacant Industrial zoned land.</li> </ul>
28	<ul> <li>Mr. Best reviews suggested conditions or alternatives if approval is considered:</li> </ul>
29 30	<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, a development agreement addressing all the elements would be a condition of approval.</li> </ul>
31 32	<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, there is no current proposal before the County.</li> </ul>
33 34	• <b>QUESTION:</b> Chair Allen asks if conditions of the rezone would travel and bind the land for any successors or owners.
35 36 37 38 39	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Best notes the development agreement would have an expiration date of June 2021, to keep aligned with the next Comprehensive Plan update in 2024, and would stay with the land during that time period, but if conditions are not met, the rezone will expire and zoning will revert. Maps will be unchanged until conditions are met.</li> </ul>
40 41	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Svensson asks if staff is recommending approval with the listed conditions.</li> </ul>
42	ANSWER: Mr. Best clarifies staff recommends denial but wanted to provide
-	- Alto William Dest claimes stail recommends demandat wanted to provide

43

recommendations to include if approval was considered.

1	<ul> <li>Mr. Svensson asks if a proposal like the example require a development</li></ul>
2	agreement. Mr. Best notes a development agreement is not required but
3	would be a good tool to use in addressing these issues.
4	QUESTION: Amy Maule asks what a typical timeline for this rezone might be.
5	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Best notes he is unsure how long based on the size,</li></ul>
6	development agreement and permitting process run through the County
7	and Department of Natural Resources (DNR), but could likely take years.
8	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Ms. Maule asks how often DNR reviews and whether it would be</li></ul>
9	concurrent or sequential.
10	ANSWER: Mr. Best is unsure of frequency; the County sees it as sequential.
11	6:34:14
12	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Ms. Maule asks if reclamation happening sooner rather than later could</li></ul>
13	have any benefit on environmental or safety issues.
14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Best notes a recent comment came in, noting this was listed as a contaminated Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) site, the comment hasn't been verified. The advantage of reclaiming upfront is it is free and clear of the burdens and process of establishing a reclamation plan for restrictions proposed for the site, might make it quicker to turn around for whatever future use in future, but would have to follow currently adopted plan, which is very vague.</li> </ul>
21	<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Ms. Maule asks, and Mr. Best confirms, environmental cleanup</li></ul>
22	would be much stricter for residential than industrial.
23	6:36:45
24	<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Mr. Best confirms the same notification</li></ul>
25	process and 800-foot radius requirement applies.
26	<ul> <li>Mr. Eliason appreciates the comment matrix format that shows each written</li></ul>
27	comment and the staff response to each.
28	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Eliason asks about the analysis noted in the Puget Sound Regional</li></ul>
29	Council, and inclusion of the Bremerton and unincorporated county areas.
30	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Best notes Attachment C12 provides more information.</li> </ul>
31	<ul> <li>Mr. Eliason asks about staff's stated validity concerns from the 2015 report.</li> </ul>
32	<ul> <li>Mr. Best notes the logic in the PSRC report is the same, but the</li></ul>
33	methodology is different than what the County uses; No line by line
34	comparison has been performed.
35 36	• QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks about the build out percentages; Mr. Best will get that data.
37	<ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Eliason asks for staff's comment on the liquefaction report completed</li></ul>
38	by NL Olson engineering.
39	<ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Best notes the summary agreement that reasonable</li></ul>
40	construction measures could be used to ensure no danger if seismic event.
41	<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the consultant was</li></ul>
42	hired by the applicant.

hired by the applicant.

1 2		<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Mr. Best confirms, adjacent property pits are not owned by same company.</li> </ul>
3 4 5		<ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the road connection currently proposed is a gated emergency only connection, which the Fire Marshal approved, but Public Works would like to see opened as a Right-of-Way.</li> </ul>
6		6:46:00
7	G.	Public Hearing: 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update: Peter Best, DCD PEP Planner
8 9		<ul> <li>Chair Allen briefly reviews the guidelines for public comment, based on the number of speakers, assigns 4 minutes per speaker.</li> </ul>
10 11		<ul> <li>Applicant Representative, Levi Holmes, has requested additional speaking time during the hearing, the Department does not object, and the PC will grant 8 minutes.</li> </ul>
12		6:47:00
13		SPEAKER: Levi Holmes, JWJ Group, Applicant Representative
14 15 16		<ul> <li>More than 50% of Kitsap County residents live in a detached single-family residence (SFR), but SFR detached housing is not allowed in a high percentage of Kitsap County.</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20		<ul> <li>Regarding the regional center, it's really important throughout this process and decision, to stick with assumptions in the land capacity analysis plan. It can be easy to get lost in some of the details and what could be. There is a specified range of minimum/maximum allowable.</li> </ul>
21 22 23		<ul> <li>Went through regional center, approx. 660 acres if multiplied by the maximum density, could be a population of 71,000. It's Important to stick to that or it will not be apples to apple comparison.</li> </ul>
24 25 26		<ul> <li>Proposing this project, could be a great mixed-use community, with urban low next door, neighborhood commercial, could be live/work units, commercial, with living above, there is lots of potential.</li> </ul>
27 28 29 30		<ul> <li>We are not submitting a development project on this site; again, it's important to stay at a Comprehensive Plan level, not a project specific level. There will be lots to configure with setbacks, community, neighbors, that would be figured out in the project.</li> </ul>
31 32 33 34 35 36		<ul> <li>As far as neighboring airport, this is considered a public/private airport. The landing strip is the only part considered public; there is no public road connection, no way they could land and then drive to Silverdale, unless they have specific permission from property owners. Future expansion would not be allowed for the airport. In discussions with neighbors, they view it more as a use for medical transport to hospitals.</li> </ul>
37 38 39 40		<ul> <li>This is a non-project action. Details are addressed in the staff report, but many are project-specific; A lot of these details and questions came up about the SEPA checklist, but DNS and no mitigation is what was provided – all the other questions issues can be provided in project specific plans later.</li> </ul>
41 42		<ul> <li>For Roads, Public Works asked to make a public connection, but our current easement does not allow us to extend the road beyond. It would be onerous</li> </ul>
43 44		to put that action on us when we don't own adjacent properties. Maybe down the road, when a project is submitted, but we have been speaking to

1 2	neighbors who don't want full access, they want it limited to gated and locked emergency access only, which is allowable by the Fire Marshal.
3 4	<ul> <li>On Compatible Use, look at an entire area 100% surrounded by Residential, Urban Low or Urban Residential use. They are compatible</li> </ul>
5	next to each, other.
6	<ul> <li>None of the application exhibits and submittals were included in the Staff</li> </ul>
7	narrative or presentation, but I will provide those to the PC, for inclusion
8	into the record.
9	If a development agreement would be subject to the County leaving a
10 11	portion as industrial, as part of the buffer, it would pose a significant burden.
12	<ul> <li>Additional comments and exhibits will be submitted through written</li> </ul>
13	comment to address additional concerns that we haven't been able to
14	address in the time given.
15	6:56:20
16	<ul> <li>SPEAKER: Richard Shattuck, Resides and works in Central Kitsap</li> </ul>
17	<ul> <li>Has recused himself from the Planning Commission dais, as he served as a</li> </ul>
18	trustee of the blind trust for 20 of the 30 acres added to this project, on the
19	map the legend shows an area that says abandoned mine.
20	<ul> <li>Tried to have an industrial development put on the site, and we tried to get</li> </ul>
21	different bites, but we got nothing for years and years. Planning
22	Commissioner Maule mentioned environmental concerns, and what we did
23	experience was a lot of dumping, including medical waste and syringes, that
24	were dumped on this site, which is on the way to the dump. This is what led
25	to us bringing in and having an environmental site clean-up.
26	<ul> <li>Planning Commissioner Phillips asked me over the years to let my issue with</li> </ul>
27	the West Hills area-imposed zoning go but I just couldn't do it, and I can't do
28	it here. We tried for 7 years to get this site sold, but if we leave this zoning,
29	we are damning this area to sit fallow. I can't sell a piece of property, that
30	already has infrastructure, when there is the cost and burden of reclamation
31	with the current zoning.
32	<ul> <li>What we will get is use compatible with use, getting fill and bring dumping</li> </ul>
33	from other areas and fill in the old mine.
34	<ul> <li>Let's do something that actually has a market that we can take the</li> </ul>
35	opportunity and make it into something good.
36	7:00:15
37	<ul> <li>SPEAKER: Patty Charnas, Resident Clear Ridge Avenue in Silverdale</li> </ul>
38	<ul> <li>Expressing strong support for this rezone and categorical opposition to the</li> </ul>
39	staff report reasons for denial. Lives less than a mile away and walk the area
40	often. This project would be a welcome addition to the area.
41	<ul> <li>Was previously the manager of Kitsap County DCD Long Range Planning, 3</li> </ul>
42	years ago, left to be the director of a neighboring jurisdiction; Familiar with
43	multiple projects and area plans, as well as the County's obligations under

1 2	the Growth Management Act (GMA) and Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC).
3 4	<ul> <li>After reviewing the staff report, I do not find consistent compelling reasons to support the staff recommendations, instead there are areas of support,</li> </ul>
5	opposition and contradiction but no defensible cause for denial.
6	<ul> <li>In classic sense, this is consistent with GMA policy, by driving growth to</li> </ul>
7	designated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and provided services. There is also
8	no clear basis showing a punitive impact on the Silverdale Regional Growth
9	Center.
LO	<ul> <li>Last weekend walked the site with a friend, and there are concerns, with the</li> </ul>
L1	site and limitations, but these appear to have been addressed in the staff
12	report.
13	Thank you for your consideration. As a member of the community in the
L4	immediate area, this is the right thing to do, it is a good project. I encourage
L5 L6	the PC and the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) to do the right thing and support the rezone.
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
17 18	• SPEAKER: Holly Blinn, former Planner Kitsap County DCD, current planner employed by the project proponent JWJ Group.
19 20	Have reviewed many projects for compatibility with Kitsap County Code  (KCC) allowed uses reping density and dimension, and collaborated with
20 21	(KCC), allowed uses, zoning, density and dimension, and collaborated with other staff and departments for transportation, road requirements.
22 23	<ul> <li>Most of the concerns raised in the staff report are non-project specific and are not at the rezone level.</li> </ul>
-3 24	
24 25	<ul> <li>Staff has prepared other reports for non-project actions, such as the UVC zone, to remove density, and done a good job at review and</li> </ul>
<u>2</u> 6	recommendation for these non-project actions.
27	<ul> <li>Addressing the Industrial land supply, staff contends it would reduce vacant</li> </ul>
28	available industrial land by 50% and 36% of vacant land, but the subject
29	properties were considered developed at the time of analysis, so they were
30	never included in those numbers, and the County should not choose to
31	include them now in a possible future state.
32	<ul> <li>Only Attachment C13 was prepared by independent analysts, the other</li> </ul>
33	reports were prep by staff planners.
34	<ul> <li>As noted throughout staff report, subject properties were considered</li> </ul>
35	developed and not part of the available Industrial lands inventory, and it
36	also leaves the Puget Sound Industrial Center (PSIC) out of the analysis.
37 38	There has been very little development since then, and many have included
	low impact development projects.
39 10	<ul> <li>Note that Staff Report Exhibit A, should be referencing exhibit C1, just a possible typo.</li> </ul>
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	<ul> <li>Additional comments and exhibit items will be submitted to the record.</li> </ul>

7:07:00

43

44

• SPEAKER: Joanne Bartlett, Biologist/Scientist for Ecological Land Services, worked for the project proponent on critical areas.

1	<ul> <li>There are a lot more requirements for residential use for critical areas, if the</li></ul>
2	pit stays the same, there will be no improvement; but opportunities exist.
3	<ul> <li>Portions of the watershed have been impacted by the previous pit, but</li></ul>
4	there are further opportunities for improve protections and habitat for
5	other wildlife, not birds though, due to the airport and its considerations
6	and restrictions.
7	<ul> <li>Restoration of sediment ponds that were not part of critical areas, but they</li></ul>
8	could be improved to create additional critical or habitat areas for wildlife.
9 10 11	<ul> <li>By improving the upper portion of Strawberry Creek, as well as Little Anderson creek, you can improve water quality, mitigating pit activities, improving them to current standards.</li> </ul>
12	7:09:50
13	<ul> <li>SPEAKER: Norm Olson, NL Olson, Provided Engineering and Geotech services (no site</li></ul>
14	design) for the applicant.
15	<ul> <li>Comments are not so much project related or specific, but want to speak</li></ul>
16	anecdotally on County development.
17	<ul> <li>There are 34 finished lots across from this pit, also the Silverthorne</li></ul>
18	development with 36 lots. Those 2 plats essentially border this project, and
19	whatever it becomes, whether it be residential or commercial and industrial.
20	After this land, there is no other land available, it is built out.
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	<ul> <li>Regarding the recommendation for denial, based on land capacity reduction, our firm does many plat work designs, with the complexity of what we do, the only way we can do it is based on how high the cost is of these lots; an example is Woodbridge in Silverdale, half million yards of material moved up the road, and lots of required mitigation. That is feasible because of what it costs. If 80 acres of rock is required to be moved to allow for housing, it's only possible due to demand and price costs; if there were a great deal of developable land, they wouldn't be so high priced. This is market driven.</li> </ul>
29	<ul> <li>Regarding not having adequate industrial land, lots of work is done in the</li></ul>
30	South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA), it's not included for various reasons; that
31	cross-SKIA connector road has cost millions, and since the road was
32	constructed no new industrial development has been put in.
33	<ul> <li>This proposed area is prime for development.</li> </ul>
34	
35	7:13:00
36	SPEAKER: Steve Sego, of Waterman Mitigation Partners; Port Orchard resident
37	<ul> <li>Has worked on evaluation of habitat inventory for sites appropriate for</li></ul>
38	restoration, enhancement and preservation. From this area, but spent
39	decades around Alaska and other areas, developing a wetland mitigation
40	bank. After returning 10 years ago, realized the need for this inventory, and
41	also balance of growth management and development needs all over the
42	area.
43	<ul> <li>Heard about this proposal a few years back, and it is most intriguing. This is</li></ul>
44	the origin, or headwaters, for salmonid stream system.

1	<ul> <li>This is an exciting opportunity because the headwaters can be more</li></ul>
2	important than the mouth, which is where many energies focused; but
3	could be important for critical improvements.
4	<ul> <li>Current owners are based on the buffers, setbacks required in that zoning,</li></ul>
5	and doing what they are supposed to, and were intended to do.
6	<ul> <li>This is an opportunity to do something that will benefit those both of those</li></ul>
7	stream systems and positively affect the eco system in Kitsap County.
8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Mr. Best stated this has been zoned industrial since before the 1<sup>st</sup>         Comprehensive Plan, and as Mr. Shattuck noted, planning is about planning as best as we can but now, we are in a position where we can do something good.     </li> </ul>
12	<ul> <li>Please consider rejecting the denial and supporting this rezone.</li> </ul>
13	7:17:46
14	• SPEAKER: John Johnson, Kitsap resident since 1984.
15	<ul> <li>Completed my first short plat in 1987, and have done many since then,</li></ul>
16	including multiple projects with Gary Lindsey.
17	<ul> <li>Couple points, we only had 7 business days to respond to the staff report;</li></ul>
18	we have worked closely with and established a relationship with the County
19	Very disappointed in the staff report; it seemed they took every opportunity
20	to turn it down after all that work.
21	<ul> <li>We have created a matrix that takes every reason for denial and countered</li></ul>
22	it with facts and additional comments to consider, not summaries, but
23	actual facts.
24	<ul> <li>If you decide to approve with conditions, we do feel it would be</li></ul>
25	unreasonable to require roads such as the County asked for.
26	<ul> <li>Levi is a real fan of SEPA and has been looking for an opportunity to achieve</li></ul>
27	mixed use, achieve the goals; we spent a lot of time working with Mr. Best.
28	<ul> <li>This is an opportunity to reclaim something. If you look at properties for</li></ul>
29	sale in that industrial area, there are just a few and very little buying
30	opportunity. There is no demand for industrial land in Kitsap, and this
31	property won't be bought and reclaimed, the setbacks, the wildlife,
32	environmental opportunities will be gone.
33	<ul> <li>Appreciate the time the PC puts into the process, it is the one time citizens</li></ul>
34	can ask you to look at the facts and make decision for what is truly best for
35	the County.
36	<ul> <li>Our additional comments will be submitted.</li> </ul>
37	7:21:35
38	SPEAKER: Chuck Madwell, Attorney on behalf of applicant
39	<ul> <li>Few points of support, regarding denial, we prepared a matrix because</li> </ul>
40	there are so many facts, allegations and points from this staff report and
41	recommendation to be addressed and the matrix responds to each issue.
42	<ul> <li>Invites the PC to review the matrix and see why the evidence in staff report</li></ul>
43	does not support the denial recommendation.

1 2 3	<ul> <li>In my experience with Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) cases, we would find the proposed amendment is in alignment with GMA requirements.</li> </ul>
4 5	<ul> <li>Errors in the staff report assumptions justifying substantial changed conditions include:</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Completion of mine in readiness for development; in 2009, this was already considered developed, not included as part of available land; now has to be reconsidered and it is the perfect time to consider whether it should remain industrial or change; we propose change.</li> </ul>
10	<ul> <li>Kitsap region is experiencing a housing crisis.</li> </ul>
11 12	<ul> <li>Industrial demand is minimal to nonexistent, which should be considered when looking at this CPA.</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Staff alleges incompatibility with surrounding uses, this is not a legitimate basis for denial, with no evidence to support it, at the non- project level. These issues can and should be addressed at the project review level; Capital facilities, density, noise – none are considered significant in the DNS issued for this project.</li> </ul>
18	<ul> <li>Evidence does not support denial, ask you recommend approval.</li> </ul>
19	7:26:00
20	BREAK
21	7:32:18
22 23	<ul> <li>SPEAKER: Mike Costello, owner and managing member of adjacent mining site, 2<sup>nd</sup></li> <li>largest owner of industrial property in the area.</li> </ul>
24 25 26	<ul> <li>Heard comments that these sites don't move or sell, but I bought in 2012.</li> <li>The prior owner had site for years and it was used as a dump site; no surprise.</li> </ul>
27 28 29	<ul> <li>Biggest concern is with compatibility. The asphalt and mining, industry means lots of noise and smells happens; noise requirements in these zones are different from residential</li> </ul>
30 31 32 33	<ul> <li>Our site is right across the street, but we sit down in a deep hole with 40 acres next to the proposed land use change for residential. There is a concern that we will lose the ability to mine all that area out; we dig 100 ft deep holes.</li> </ul>
34 35 36	<ul> <li>Large concern with an asphalt plant that immediately borders where they want to put residential. The operation is noisy, and it stinks, but we haven't had complaints for decades, but no one lives next door.</li> </ul>
37 38 39 40 41	<ul> <li>Intent is to mine the entire property out; have some concern with putting neighborhood next to an active mine suite when we are required to keep people out. It's already difficult, we have had people break in, ride motorcycles other trouble. How do you prevent that? We have 100 foot sloped walls, but I can't imagine putting a neighborhood right behind.</li> </ul>

1 2 3	<ul> <li>Looking at the North end, it's not as concerning, visually it would cut the area in half and be a safe distance; just have a big concern with how it will be compatible with the current, active mining use.</li> </ul>
4	SPEAKER: Lisa Kittilsby, Owner Port Orchard Sand & Gravel
5	<ul> <li>Regarding the comment made earlier that it was a site listed as</li></ul>
6	contaminated by the EPA, it is not. It was a sand and gravel mine. This is a
7	good project and that property has sat with nothing going on there for a
8	very long time. Please support this rezone.
9	7:37:42
10	SPEAKER: Ryan Ransavage, Geologist, Expert is Glacial Sediment.
11	<ul> <li>Appreciate the County looking at protecting sand and gravel, it is a big thing</li></ul>
12	to take time and consider.
13	<ul> <li>Site remains active since 1984, been hanging on for a long time; pre-GMA</li></ul>
14	thinking about future use in this site – it is called a legacy site, there are 3
15	phases of a site exploration, extraction, reclamation.
16	<ul> <li>This is an excellent opportunity, marketable for community; takes sand and</li></ul>
17	gravel site and changes it. You don't see that much, it's not like growing
18	trees, theoretically, you can grow trees and food in lots of places, but not
19	sand and gravel.
20	<ul> <li>DNR has exclusive rights to regulate these, unless the County takes on the</li></ul>
21	rights of all locations; no county has done that yet.
22	<ul> <li>When people mention dumping here, it should be noted it is non-structural</li></ul>
23	dirt or fill; it's not trash or garbage, it's fill dirt.
24	<ul> <li>Mr. Best noted dust or noise, there are currently CUP requirements for</li></ul>
25	every concern; these are addressed at the site level.
26	GMA allows for this in section 365.196.480.
27	7:41:00
28	<ul> <li>SPEAKER: Dean Moergeli, resident of Port Orchard, Owner of Port Orchard Sand &amp;</li></ul>
29	Gravel
30	<ul> <li>We mined this site for years, with an expansion back in 1980-1982. We had</li></ul>
31	the property owners opposed at the time, funny enough the attorney
32	representing them was Phil Best.
33	<ul> <li>Over 18 – 20 years, we have reclaimed most of the property, but a small</li></ul>
34	area still hasn't been, and it does have some growth and trees on it.
35	<ul> <li>Also want to state this site is not listed on the EPA contaminated site list.</li> </ul>
36	<ul> <li>Question the mine next door, they are hoping to have 40-50 years of gravel</li></ul>
37	to supply, we went through 40 acres in 15 years.
38	<ul> <li>Land has been vacant for 20 years, we quit mining in 1998-2000, looking for</li></ul>
39	someone to do a quality project and take this over; JWJ can do a nice quality
40	project. Really hope you support rezone.
41	7: 43:51
42	SPEAKER: Patricia Larson, Miles Sand & Gravel

1 2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>In support of the project. Have been in redevelopment of mining plans for over 15 years. This project is well thought out; this is an opportunity for the PC to do something different and allow this developer to bring in a high- quality project. Dupont is a similar site; citizens have access to commercial properties, shopping, and it has a real community feel. I think this project would do the same.</li> </ul>
7 8	<ul> <li>Mining is not meant to be forever, when project is complete and mining is done then it's time for a new project; that is this time for this project.</li> </ul>
9	SPEAKER: Rick Smith, RTS Enterprises
10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Speaking about the Mineral Resource Overall (MRO) Removal. I am a neighboring property owner; I am mainly here because I purchased a small parcel, south of the Apex Airport, and it was not disclosed as MRO when I bought it. After going through the entire permitting process, 2 months later we got a letter stating it was a mistake.</li> </ul>
15	<ul> <li>Here to ask for support in removal of the MRO.</li> </ul>
16	7:46:45
17	<ul> <li>SPEAKER: Tyler Hunt, Lifelong community member, Southworth neighbor</li> </ul>
18 19 20	<ul> <li>I am not in opposition but want to speak of traffic flow in and out of Silverdale. Have lived on Newberry Hill for 5 years, 10 years as a teacher at Central Kitsap High School (CKHS), my wife teaches at Silverdale Elementary.</li> </ul>
21 22	<ul> <li>Have seen students time and time again, we all sit stuck in this traffic, unfortunately also had a friend killed in the same area.</li> </ul>
23 24 25	<ul> <li>Opposed to project without any upgrades to traffic flow opportunities into Silverdale from the west side. It can take 30 minutes to travel half mile up Provost from CKHS.</li> </ul>
26 27 28	<ul> <li>Our school district was told to change the start times of middle and high schools, to accommodate the traffic flows. If this is a known issue why isn't it addressed?</li> </ul>
29 30 31 32	<ul> <li>Have spoken with Levi (Holmes) about the minimum number of trips which is projected at 300, I think it is more like 800. With all the potential growth, where are they going to do, I loop down and around for a mile additional out of my way, just to avoid the area.</li> </ul>
33 34 35 36 37	<ul> <li>County has to recognize the issues of traffic flow in Silverdale already, and need to widen Silverdale way onto Newberry, Anderson hill is a mess to say the least. I, and fellow community members also have concerns with additional flow onto Dickey Road and Willamette. New residential area means more schools, which means more traffic.</li> </ul>
38	7:50:30
39	SPEAKER: Kathy Sinn, neighbor of the proposed site.
40	<ul> <li>We live west of gravel and asphalt pit. When wind comes from the east, we</li> </ul>
41	smell it, although we don't smell it all the time, because wind flow on our
42	property is from the south. These new properties are going to be in the
43	direct path for the smells; even though county has codes on smells, in the

1 2		past asphalt hasn't had to worry about it because there haven't been homes in its path. At times it is very strong for us; just isn't a way to control smells.
3		Chair Allen calls for any additional speakers.
4 5		<ul> <li>Hearing no additional speakers, Chair Allen closes the Public Hearing, the record remains open until midnight tomorrow.</li> </ul>
6		7:51:55
7	Н.	Approval of Minutes (postponed from Item D)
8		<ul> <li>MOTION: Mr. Shattuck moves to adopt the Minutes of 12/17/2019 as presented.</li> </ul>
9		SECOND: Mr. Svensson
10		<ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in favor – Motion carries.</li> </ul>
11		<ul> <li>MOTION: Mr. Eliason moves to adopt the Minutes of 01/07/2019 as presented.</li> </ul>
12		SECOND: Mr. Murphy
13		<ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in favor – Motion carries.</li> </ul>
14		7:54:45
15	I.	General Elections (postponed from item C)
16		Chair Allen reviews process, calls for nominations for Chair
17		NOMINATION: Mr. Murphy nominates Richard Shattuck.
18		SECOND: Mr. Phillips seconds
19 20		<ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck declines as he may be unavailable during much of the second half of the year.</li> </ul>
21		Nomination withdrawn
22		NOMINATION: Mr. Svensson nominates Mike Eliason
23		SECOND: Ed Galliway
24		Mr. Eliason accepts the nomination
25		VOTE: Unanimous in favor – Motion Carries
26		Chair Allen calls for nominations for Vice Chair
27		NOMINATION: Mr. Shattuck nominates Joe Phillips
28		SECOND: Mr. Eliason
29		Mr. Phillips accepts the nomination
30		VOTE: 8 in favor; 0 opposed
31	J.	For the Good of the Order
32 33 34		<ul> <li>Darren Gurnee, DCD PEP Planner, notes the Zoning Use Table Update project was previously scheduled to come to the PC in late January, will instead come in late February or March.</li> </ul>
35 36 37		<ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck, and the entire Planning Commission, expresses appreciation to Kim Allen, who has done an excellent job, kept us on track despite a very busy schedule and provided much expertise.</li> </ul>
38 39 40		<ul> <li>Mr. Galliway asks, and Mr. best confirms, Deliberations and Recommendation for the 2019 CPA Update is on schedule for the 2/4/20 PC meeting. Additional comments and submissions to the record will eb forwarded to the PC, including the opposing matrix.</li> </ul>

1	<ul> <li>Kim Allen thanks Mr. Murphy for serving as Vice Chair and stepping in to Chair in her</li> </ul>
2	absence.
3	
4	Time of Adjournment: 8:010:18 pm
5	
6	Minutes approved this <u>18th</u> day of <u>February</u> 2020.
7	
8	Midael is
9	Michael Eliason, Planning Commission Chair
10	$\mathcal{A}_{i}$
11	(Amanda Walston for)
12	Robyn Readwin, Planning Commission Clerk